

County of Los Angeles CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE

713 KENNETH HAHN HALL OF ADMINISTRATION • LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 (213) 974-1101 http://cao.co.la.ca.us

REVISED 8/7/06: CORRECTION IN ITALICS ON PAGE 2

Board of Supervisors GLORIA MOLINA First District

YVONNE B. BURKE Second District

ZEV YAROSLAVSKY Third District

DON KNABE Fourth District

MICHAEL D. ANTONOVICH Fifth District

August 4, 2006

To:

Mayor Michael D. Antonovich

Supervisor Gloria Molina Supervisor Yvonne B. Burke Supervisor Zev Yaroslavsky Supervisor Don Knabe

From:

David E. Janssen " \" Chief Administrative Officer

MOTION TO SUPPORT PROPOSITION 84, THE CLEAN WATER, PARKS AND COASTAL PROTECTION BOND ACT OF 2006 (ITEM NO. 5 AGENDA, OF AUGUST 8, 2006)

Item No. 5 on the August 8, 2006 agenda is a motion by Supervisor Yaroslavsky to support Proposition 84, the Clean Water, Parks and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006, and encourage all voters in Los Angeles County and throughout California to support the ballot measure at the November 7, 2006 Statewide General Election.

Proposition 84, placed on the ballot by the initiative petition process, would authorize \$5.388 billion in State General Obligation bonds for projects statewide to manage water resources, provide flood control, protect coastal resources, conserve wildlife habitat, and support parks and other recreational opportunities, subject to voter approval. Expenditure of most of the bond funds requires the Legislature to appropriate the funds in the annual budget act or other legislation.

The proposition has eight major funding categories: 1) Safe Drinking Water and Water Quality (\$1.525 billion); 2) Flood Control (\$800 million); 3) Statewide Planning (\$65 million); 4) Protection of Rivers, Lakes and Streams (\$928 million); 5) Forest and Wildlife Conservation (\$450 million); 6) Protection of Beaches, Bays, and Coastal, and Waters (\$540 million); 7) Parks and Nature Education Facilities (\$500 million); and 8) Sustainable Communities and Climate Change Reduction (\$580 million). There are no per capita formulas included in the proposition, and no funds are specifically

Each Supervisor August 4, 2006 Page 2

earmarked for County projects. However, if the proposition passes, the Los Angeles County region would be allocated a portion of the \$215 million for Integrated Regional Water Management planning efforts in the Los Angeles sub-region, which includes Ventura County and the Greater Los Angeles County Region, and \$27 million for the North/South Lahontan region, which includes the Antelope Valley, for projects to improve water quality and water reliability. The proposition earmarks a minimum of \$135 million to local land conservancies including the Baldwin Hills Conservancy, the San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy, the Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy, and the Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission. As the conservancies will likely grant these funds to other agencies for specific projects, the County may become the recipient of a portion of these funds. In addition. nearly \$2 billion would be available for competitive grant programs, and the County would be eligible to compete in most of the categories, including the Clean Beaches Program, Local Flood Control Subventions, Local and Regional Parks, Parks and Nature Education Facilities. Stormwater Pollution Prevention, and Urban Stream Restoration. The attached chart provides a breakdown of the major funding categories in the proposition that would benefit the Los Angeles County region.

According to the State Legislative Analyst, approximately \$13.7 billion in bonds have been approved by the voters since 1980 for various resource-related purposes. *About \$1.3 billion of these funds are uncommitted and available for new projects, mostly for water-related projects.* It is estimated that Proposition 84 will result in a total State cost of \$10.5 billion over the 30 years allowed to pay the principal and interest on these bonds, at a rate of \$350 million per year. Land acquisition with Proposition 84 funds will reduce local property taxes by up to several million dollars statewide, with about one-half of any losses reimbursed to school districts under State law. Also, to the extent that bond funds are used for acquisition and development of new facilities, State and local agencies may incur increased costs for operation and maintenance. These added costs may be partially offset by increased fees and revenue, leaving a potential net cost, statewide, in the tens of millions of dollars annually.

The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) recommends support of Proposition 84, as it will provide the best near-term opportunity for the County to compete for significant grant funding for priority park projects and resource improvements. If a per capita allocation distribution were used DPR indicates that the County would receive approximately \$20 million in local assistance grants for the acquisition, development and improvement of local and regional park and recreation facilities. In addition, the Department's competitive grant efforts, if successful could yield as much as \$10 million for nature education and research facilities at local parks and botanic gardens.

The Department of Public Works (DPW) recommends support of Proposition 84, as the proposition would provide funds for the Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (IRWMP) efforts taking place throughout the County. The Los Angeles County Flood

Each Supervisor August 4, 2006 Page 3

Control District is the lead for the IRWMP for the Greater Los Angeles County Region, and the Los Angeles County Waterworks District No. 40 is the lead for the IRWMP in the Antelope Valley. DPW reports that the proposition would make competitive grants available to implement IRWMP projects countywide to improve water quality, protect water supply, and provide open space and recreational opportunities. Funding opportunities would also be available for projects within the Los Angeles and San Gabriel River watersheds and for flood protection and floodplain mapping.

The Department of Beaches and Harbors recommends support of Proposition 84, as the measure would provide a much needed revenue source to fund wastewater treatment projects to improve water quality at public beaches and may provide an opportunity to fund projects to eliminate persistent flooding problems at Santa Monica Outfall and Zuma Creek.

Proposition 84 has been endorsed by a large number of governmental agencies, business associations, environmental groups, and individual political leaders, including: U.S. Senator Diane Feinstein, Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, State Treasure Phil Angelides, Senate President pro Tem Don Perata, Assembly Speaker Fabian Nuñez, the California Parks and Recreation Society, the California Coastal Coalition, the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce, the California League of Conservation Voters, the League of Women Voters, the League of California Cities, the Watershed Conservation Authority, the Los Angeles and San Gabriel Rivers Watershed Council, Los Angeles Conservation Corps, Heal the Bay, the Las Virgenes Municipal Water District, the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, and the Long Beach Water Department. There is no registered opposition.

Support of Proposition 84 is consistent with Board policy included in the County's State Legislative Agenda, to support measures that increase funding for environmental protection programs and capital projects, including resource, open space, and shoreline protection, Santa Monica Bay restoration, and beach restoration; however, a position on a bond related initiative, such as Proposition 84, is a matter of Board policy determination.

DEJ:GK MAL:JF:LY:cc

Attachment

c: Executive Officer, Board of Supervisors
County Counsel
Department of Beaches and Harbors
Department of Parks and Recreation
Department of Public Works

Proposition 84: The Clean Water, Parks and Coastal Protection Bond Act of 2006. Initiative Statute. \$5,388 billion

1	Program Catergories		Amount		Program Funding		County al benefit
	Safe Drinking Water and Water Quality Integrated Regional Water Management	\$	1,525,000,000	 	4 000 000 000	<u> </u>	
	1- LA sub-region local assistance grants	┦		\$	1,000,000,000	 _ _ _	045 000 00
	1- LA Sub-region local assistance grants	+-		 		\$	215,000,00
	Safe Drinking Water	1		\$	380,000,000		
	Delta and Agriculture Water Quality	上		\$	145,000,000		
2	Flood Control	s	800,000,000	1			
	State flood control projects	Ľ		\$	315,000,000		
	Flood Control Projects in the Delta			\$	275,000,000		
	Local flood control subventions			\$	180,000,000		
	· Flood plain mapping and assistance for local land use planning			\$	30,000,000		
3	Chalcoulde Mateu Planning	F	27.000.000				
	Statewide Water Planning - Planning for future water needs, water conveyance systems	\$	65,000,000	 _	05 000 000	ļ	
	and flood control projects	╂		\$	65,000,000		-
	and good dormor projects	1-				 	
4	Protection of Rivers, Lakes and Streams	\$	928,000,000			<u> </u>	······································
	Regional Conservancies			\$	279,000,000		
	1- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy	1				\$	36,000,000
•	San Gabriel and Lower Los Angeles Rivers and Mountains Conservancy		***************************************			\$	36,000,000
	Stormwater poliution prevention		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\$	90,000,000		
	California River Parkways Act of 2004			\$	72,000,000		-
	Urban stream restoration	上	··	\$	18,000,000		
	California Conservation Corps			\$	45,000,000		
	Other projects			\$	424,000,000		
5	Farsak and Wildlife Occasionalism	-		-			•
	Forest and Wildlife Conservation - Wildlife habitat protection	\$	450,000,000	\$	225,000,000		
	Forest conservation			\$	180,000,000		
	- Protection of ranches, farms and oak woodlands			\$	45,000,000		
6	Protection of Beaches, Bays and Coastal Waters	\$	540,000,000	-			
	- State Coastal Conservancy	<u> </u>	540,000,000	\$	135,000,000		
	Regional Conservancies	 		•	005 000 000		
•	1- Baldwin Hills Conservancy	╂		\$	225,000,000	<u> </u>	40.000.000
	2- Rivers and Mountains Conservancy*	 				\$	10,000,000
	3- Santa Monica Mountains Conservancy	\vdash			*	\$	20,000,000
						<u> </u>	25,000,000
	Clean Beaches Program Santa Monica Bay Restoration Commission		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	\$	90,000,000	not less tha	
	California Ocean Protection Trust Fund	<u> </u>		\$	90,000,000	\$	18,000,000
· ·				Φ	90,000,000		
7	Parks and Nature Education Facilities	\$	500,000,000	L			
	Acquisition, development, and restoration of the State Parks	↓		\$	400,000,000	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	Local parks for nature education and research facilities		11_1	\$	100,000,000		
	Ruchinghla Communities and Olimete Observe Dad	1-	F00 050 055	<u> </u>			
8	Sustainable Communities and Climate Change Reduction Local and regional parks**	\$	580,000,000	\$	400,000,000		
	Urban water and energy conservation projects			\$	90,000,000		
	Incentive for conservation in local planning	-		\$	90,000,000		
					,,		

^{*} Likely misprint in the initiative text. Reference to the San Gabriel and Lower LA Rivers and Mountains Conservancy is assumed.

^{**} Funds may be allocated to existing programs or subject to legislation enacted to implement this subdivision